REMARKS

Applicant is in receipt of the Office Action mailed January 20, 2004. Claims 1 - 8 were pending. Applicant has cancelled claims 1 - 8 without prejudice to the subject matter therein, and added new claims 9 - 27. Claims 1 - 27 remain pending in the application.

The Examiner states that the effective filing date for the subject matter defined in the pending claim in this application is October 5, 2000. Applicant notes that the current application claims priority from several provisional patent applications, all of which were filed on October 5, 1999. Applicants further note that, if the Examiner wishes to allege that the claims of the present application are not entitled to the priority date of October 5, 1999, the Examiner has the burden to present evidence or reasons, not just bare assertions, why persons skilled in the art would not recognize support for the claim. *In re Wertheim*, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976).

The Examiner has objected to the drawings for including reference signs not included in the description, and for including a number of references in the specification that are not present in the drawings.

Applicant submits herewith formal drawings. Applicant further notes that reference signs 250 and 254, which the Examiner had objected to as being not included in the description, may be found on page 6, lines 25 and 27, respectively. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner list the specific references in the specification that are not present in the drawings.

Claims 1 – 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant believes these rejections to be moot in light of Applicant's amendments to the claims.

Claims 1, 2 and 5 – 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Geaghan et al. (USPN 5,790,114, hereinafter "Geaghan") in view of Rothschild et al. (USPN 5,822,523, hereinafter "Rothschild"). Claims 3 – 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Geaghan in view of Rothschild in further view of Belsan et al. (USPN 5,403,639, hereinafter "Belsan"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections, but also notes that these rejections are moot.

Geaghan teaches an electronic white board coupled to a computer which receives information from the whiteboard indicative of graphical user input entered via a writing region of the whiteboard. (Abstract) Specifically, Geaghan teaches that a snapshot may be created by the user or automatically by the application software to allow creation of an image which is the composite of all graphical user inputs from a first marker inserted in the session file to a second, subsequent marker inserted in the session file. The application software implements a view function to display all of the snapshots in a session file and to allow selection viewing and manipulation of a particular snapshot. (Col. 2, lines 14-21)

Rothschild teaches a method for deploying interactive applications over a network containing host computers and group messaging servers. The method operates in a conventional unicast network architecture comprised of conventional network links and unicast gateways and routers. The hosts send message containing destination group addresses by unicast to group messaging servers, and the group addresses select message groups maintained by the group messaging servers. For each message group, the group messaging servers also maintain a list of all the hosts that are members of the particular group. (Abstract)

Applicant can find no language within Geaghan that teaches or suggests "creating a snapshot image from a software application running on a first computer, wherein the snapshot image includes at least one process, state information associated with the process and an identifier associated with the software application," as recited in

Applicant's claim 9. Geaghan teaches a snapshot which is the composite of a plurality of graphical user inputs from an electronic whiteboard. Furthermore, Geaghan's snapshot of graphical user inputs does not include "at least one process, state information associated with the process and an identifier associated with the software application," as recited in Applicant's claim 9.

Accordingly, claim 9 is believed to patentably distinguish over the cited references. Claims 10 - 14 are dependent upon claim 9. As such, these claims are also believed to patentably distinguish over the cited reference for at least the same reason.

Claims 15 and 21 recite features similar to claim 9, and are thus also believed to be patentably distinguishable for at least the same reason along with their dependent claims.

In light of the above remarks, further traversal of the Examiner's rejections is believed to be unnecessary at this time.

The Office Action states that the IDS was considered by the Examiner, and that a copy of the PTO-1449 was returned with the Office Action. However, Applicant did not receive a copy of the PTO-1449 form. Applicant respectfully requests a copy of the PTO-1449 form with the next action, initialed and signed by the Examiner to evidence consideration of the IDS.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits the application is now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 50-1505\5760-22200\LJM.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:
Return Receipt Postcard
Replacement Drawing Sheets 1-15
Request for Approval of Drawing Changes
Notice of Change of Address
Marked-up Copy of Amended Claims
Marked-up Copy of Amended Paragraphs

Respectfully submitted,

Lawrence I Merkel Reg. No. 41,191

AGENT FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.

P.O. Box 398

Austin, Texas 78767-0398 Phone: (512) 853-8800

Date: April 19, 2004